

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 163

CG 013 764

AUTHOR Lakin, Martin; And Others
 TITLE Group Processes in Helping Groups: Toward a Developmental Perspective.
 PUB DATE Jun 79
 NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Developmental (5th Biennial, Lund, Sweden, June 25-29, 1979)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Adult Development; *Age Differences; College Students; Developmental Psychology; *Developmental Stages; Discussion Groups; *Group Dynamics; *Helping Relationship; *Interaction; Older Adults

ABSTRACT

Group interaction research typically focusses on behavior under "laboratory" conditions rather than in less contrived situations. Observation of natural group behaviors at different ages can effect a better understanding of their occurrence and patterning at various developmental stages. Knowledge of age-related group behavior tendencies could benefit socialization therapy, and peer-social experience knowledge. Group helping, using a discussion-support-group format, was chosen for a group combining elderly, older university students, and young college students. The elderly and older exceeded the young in boundary behaviors, conflicts, self-disclosures, and frequency of leader interventions. The groups were similar in support manifestations, subgrouping, organizing, and such group initiations to the leader as appeals, queries, and comments. For both general groups, self-disclosure coincided with support, while group-to-leader initiatives negatively correlated with conflict, as did boredom with conflict and self-disclosure. Various possibilities for the significance of the elderly boundary behavior exist, but caution in their interpretation is suggested. However, the findings do encourage the idea of developmental group interaction and the eventual improvement of group helping facilitation for different age groups. (LS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Group Processes in Helping Groups:

Toward a Developmental Perspective*

Martin Lakin, Janis Bremer and Bruce Oppenheimer

Duke University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martin Lakin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Background

This is a report of research in progress. While the focus in this particular report is on group processes in two age groups--elderly and young adults--the overall research plan involves a developmental framework within which to view group behaviors.

Research on group interactions, especially at younger ages, has typically focussed upon such behaviors in relative isolation or in "laboratory" rather than in actual group contexts (Hartup, 1970). For example, conformity reactions among children as well as imitative behaviors have typically been observed in contrived situations (Shaw and Costanzo, 1966). This shortcoming applies even more to adult groups. We initiated comparisons of age-related group behaviors with the hope that through observations of natural group behaviors, at different ages, one might arrive at a better understanding of their occurrence and patterning at various developmental stages.

The guiding assumptions of the developmental approach to group interactions are as follows: (1) Forms of interactions, frequencies of such processes and patterns of group behaviors could usefully be considered from a life span perspective; (2) Comparisons among age groups and accrual of knowledge of age-related tendencies may reveal distinctions which could have helping implications. Put another way, knowledge and understanding

*For Presentation at the International Society for Study of Behavioral Development. Symposium on Changing Group Forms, Lund, Sweden, 1979 (June).

ED176163

CG013764

of age-related group behavior tendencies might be of benefit in socialization and therapy, as well as adding knowledge in the area of peer-social experience.

Needless to say, observations of group behaviors without a' priori categorization of group behaviors would be of little use. Hence, our first step was to develop a set of process categories for within--and across-age group studies. Our group dimensions were adapted from observations of very young children's communal living groups (Lakin, Lakin, and Costanzo, 1979) (Kibbutz nursery groups). The link between those observations and the present report is in the continuity and transition in group forms throughout the life-span. Our strategy involved an attempt to devise group behavior forms which could apply to all ages, but which would be sensitive to age-developmental shifts.

In the present investigation helping groups are the context, and the group behavior forms had to be modified to apply to such purposes. As background for the present study, it is important to understand the reasons for studying helping group processes. Groups are used for ameliorating psychological distress and for socialization as well as for education and rehabilitation at all ages. Various forms of helping groups exist; some guided by professionals, some not. For the most part, they are based on the assumption that psychological distress is ameliorated by sharing and comparing experiences. At a minimum, the opportunities provided in such groups--whether for old or for young--for sharing concerns and anxieties are intended to reduce the painful psychological isolation that comes with the apprehension that one is somehow impaired.

It is important to realize that few hard and fast distinctions can be made between the various current types of help intending groups. Consequently, although it is an over simplification, we begin from the working assumption that interaction processes in "Mental Health Discussion" groups, Encounter groups, and professionally-led psychotherapy groups all involve recognizably similar types of process interactions. This assumption is, of course, open to re-examination as later findings may indicate otherwise.

Group helping methods have long been recognized as appropriate interventions for emotional disorders and their application to a broader range of social-emotional needs and problems is now widely accepted. The discussion-support-group format is, in fact, increasingly used among segments of the population considered to be somewhat "at risk"; for instance the recently bereaved. For the provision of psychological help to aged individuals, group-discussion formats might be especially appropriate because sharing and comparing feelings and experiences appears to be, on the face of it, a corrective to feelings of rejection and isolation. At the same time, group interactions do not evoke participants' self stigmatization as "psychiatric cases" as does individual treatment. Further, group participants' dependency problems may not be as severe as those seen by individual therapists. Finally, group experiences are typically less costly than individual professional help.

In general the issue of what constitutes appropriate psychological helping interventions for elderly persons has been actively argued in

recent years. There is disagreement about their capacities to benefit from the various forms of psychological intervention. Aside from sheer prejudice, "ageist" bias or other possible irrational attitudes on the parts of therapists, legitimate questions persist regarding age-associated impairments vs. retained capacities for interaction (Butler, 1975; McGee and Lakin, 1978). If helpers understood more about old and young helpees' response tendencies, they might plan more effective helping interventions. Putting the problem in group terms, better understanding of age-related group behavior processes could facilitate development of better group helping strategies.

With the current proliferation of group approaches, there are urgent reasons for identifying group behavior response tendencies. A growing awareness of negative outcomes (Lieberman, et al., 1973; Strupp, Hadley, and Gomes-Schwartz, in press) suggests that inappropriately applied group techniques actually endanger rather than help some intended beneficiaries. It may be that some group processes are more hazardous than others for certain populations. Thus, the goals of the present study are to determine age-characteristic group behavior patterns for practical and theoretical purposes.

Method

Group process behavior dimensions developed by Lakin, Lakin and Costanzo (1979) were adapted to forms appropriate to observation of relatively sedentary (discussion-support), groups for adults. They are the following:

1. Boundary behaviors are verbal recognitions of differences in group belonging and "we/they" attributes. Examples are "we old folks," "the young people nowadays," "us senior citizens."

2. Subgrouping is coded when there is recognition of a coalition of 3 or more persons. It represents a "teaming up," usually in an attitude of solidarity vis-a-viz a position, but, as reasonably, against an individual or another subgroup.

3. Normative behaviors. Citing standards of behavior, rule making, evaluations of others, prescriptive statements (as in "shoulds" and "shouldn'ts") are the main indicators for this category.

4. Organization behaviors. Chairperson-like activities are the most obvious signs of this category, but it also includes announced changes of subject or direction, attempts to lead, to influence, or to assign roles or functions to others.

5. Establishing personal significance. Here are included various bids for recognition. It is coded whenever one "brags," (i. e., recounts personal achievements or cites family status) or claims attention for a personal attribute, skill or possession.

6. Self-disclosure is the sharing of inner feelings, relatively intimate personal experiences or problems not ordinarily told to strangers. Disclosures characteristically reveal anhedonic elements, such as losses or emotional vulnerabilities.

7. Conflict behaviors. How do members deal with the disagreements and quarrels that arise between them? Mild differences of opinion

are contrasted with more emphatic efforts to vanquish opponents and with angry quarrels.

8. Support behaviors. These are verbalized sympathetic or empathetic utterances in the form of agreement with emotional support for persons, usually on an emotional issue.

9. Group to leader is coded for instrumental and affective aspects, i. e., for responses that indicate relative group "autonomy" or dependence on leader.

10. The dimension Leader to group is coded whenever the leader intervenes (ultimately enabling the tracking of intervention effects).

11. Group tone (Emotional atmosphere). "Tone" describes the generally regnant emotional ambience at any given point in time. For this purpose we devised three subscales as follows:

- a. light to heavy
- b. comfortable to anxious
- c. attentive to bored

Figure 1 about here

Figure 1 shows the rating scales used by our coders. It will be noted that each 7-point scale is based on one of the group forms described above.

Table 1 Sample Characteristics

Insert Table 1 about here

Table 1 describes the characteristics of the old and young participants in the groups we set up.

Subjects were elderly (65 years old, plus) attenders at local Senior Citizens Centers, elderly members of the University's program in continuing education (similar age range) and college students who agreed to participate in discussion groups as a part of their psychology courses. All subjects were volunteers and were candidly informed of the experimental nature and the therapy relevant purposes of the investigation. Our purpose in drawing our elderly participants from two settings was an attempt to see whether their differing levels of education and class influenced their group behaviors. "Senior citizens" were typically middle or lower middle class persons with an average of 10 years of education. By contrast, Continuing Education elderly were mainly middle class and had an average of 16 years of education. * The young participants were recruited in the standard fashion from among volunteers for psychological experiments for which class credit is received. As described below, all participants were met prior to the group's beginning and informed of its purposes. These rationales were repeated at the group's inception.

Similar structuring of the discussion-support group experiences was done for young and old. (For young people we used essentially the same wording, as follows, and explained the project as being most directly relevant for comparative therapeutic and helping approaches in Senior Citizen Centers.) In essence, we opened thusly: "Group therapy is being widely used in clubs and centers where senior citizens gather, as well as in regu-

*At first, all participants in groups of the elderly received a token honorarium which most contributed to their Centers; this was discontinued at the request of Center directors who were concerned about adverse effects upon other Center activities.

lar mental health clinics. We don't know if talking together helps or not, so we are studying the question by observing folks at your time of life talking together. We would like you to help us in this effort by meeting together weekly to talk with each other in this small group. We are interested in seeing how you relate to one another, and we also want to hear about your concerns as well as your satisfactions at your time of life. We will observe and tape record the group sessions (introduce observer(s) and indicate position of audio recorder), and we will subsequently analyze the tapes. We are interested in what you yourselves consider important to talk about and we don't want to influence the choice of topic. You should feel free to listen to the tapes of your own group anytime you wish. Any questions? (Pause for questions.) If not, let's begin.

Process Coding Reliability

Our rates were trained to code the process scales from tapes. They coded six group tapes during the training phase. After independent simultaneous coding, they tried to resolve discrepant ratings after each training session. There were intrinsically complex processes which seemed to elicit subjective judgments. Consequently we decided that a conservative coding measure would be the mean score of two raters for raw process data. Reliability was assessed on the basis of fifteen randomly selected 10-minute segments. Pearson r correlations were calculated for each of the three pairs of raters. The mean reliability of the three pairs was then adjusted by applying the Spearman-Brown formula for estimating reliability for a larger sample of observations (Guilford, 1950). The result is the best estimate of reli-

ability for mean scores of two raters (see Table 2). Of thirteen process dimensions, four (see starred processes in Table 2) were eliminated from the present analyses because of unsatisfactory levels of interjudge reliability.

Insert Table 2 about here

Data Analysis

Although some segments were technically spoiled or missing, we were generally successful in obtaining five 10-minute segments of tape recorded interactions for each group session. Two coders coded each segment, and the total number of discrete 10-minute process segments for analysis from all the groups was 362. For the old people's groups there were 230 segments, and for the young adult groups there were 132 segments. The coders rated the 362 segments for each of the process dimensions. (A manual in preparation illustrates process coding decisions.)

Differences in process frequencies between older and younger participants were compared by T tests. Differences in process frequencies between more and less educated older adults (Continuing Education vs. Senior Citizen Center Groups) were also compared by T tests. Patterns of intercorrelations among the process dimensions were analyzed by Pearson r correlational techniques.

Insert Table 3 about here

Results

Process Frequencies Among Old and Young. There was no difference between the means of the process ratings of the following types of young and old group participants: Subgrouping, Organizing, Group to Leader, and Support. As shown in Table 3, expression of these particular group dimensions was

equivalent for our samples. However a contributory factor was the difference in educational or general S. E. S. level among the elderly. Starred categories in Table 3 are those in which there are differences among the elderly (i. e., Organizing and Group to Leader). For the former, the more highly educated elderly are actually lower in organizing efforts than either lower educated elderly and young. (1.94, 2.68, and 2.64). For the latter category mean scores are 1.71, 2.31, and 2.12 respectively.

There were significant differences between the older adults and the young adults ($p = .01$) for the expressions of the following group process dimensions: Boundary, Leader to Group, Self Disclosure and Conflict behaviors and in one subcategory of group ambience, i. e. Boredom. Of these five dimensions, the first four named are all rated significantly higher for all the older adult groups. The emotional quality Boredom was rated significantly higher for the young people's groups. Leader-to-Group was one of the dimensions affected by class and education level. It was most frequent toward less educated elderly (3.56) whereas the continuing education elderly were not distinguished from the young in this process (2.57 and 2.47 respectively).

Interprocess Correlations among old and young

As can be seen in Table 4, pairs of significantly associated group behaviors ($P = .01$) were found among the older adults and for the young adults. There were patterns common to both populations and patterns unique to each.

Patterns common to both groups

Five pairs of correlations were found for group behaviors for young as well as elderly (significant at the $P = .01$). Thus for both age populations

Group-to-leader is positively correlated with Leader-to-group. Self-disclosure is positively associated with Support behaviors. Conflict behaviors and Group-to-leader initiatives are negatively associated. Conflict behaviors are negatively correlated with rated Boredom. Similarly, Self-disclosing behaviors are also negatively associated with rated Boredom.

Patterns Unique to each Age Group

The following associations were found only among the groups of the elderly: Boundary behaviors and self-disclosures were negatively correlated. Subgrouping was positively associated with conflict, but negatively with expressions of boredom. Organizing behaviors were positively correlated with both group-to-leader and with boredom. On the other hand organization is negatively correlated with support behaviors. Finally, rated leader-to-group initiatives are positively correlated with self-disclosure.

Unique to the young adults were that: Leader-to-group initiatives were positively associated with rated boredom and, conversely, group to leader behaviors (initiatives, appeals, queries) are also positively correlated with boredom.

Discussion

The age groups differ insofar as the elderly exceed the young in rated Boundary behaviors, in Self disclosures, in Conflicts and in frequency of leader interventions. The groups are similar in terms of rated Support manifestations, Subgrouping, Organizing, and group initiations to the leader (appeals, queries, comments).

For both groups associated processes include Group-to-leader with its reciprocal, Leader-to-group. When Self disclosure occurs so does

Support. Group-to-leader initiatives are negatively correlated with Conflict and likewise, Conflict is negatively associated with Boredom. Self disclosure is also negatively correlated with Boredom.

When we compare the unique patternings of group processes of old and young we find that there are more correlated dimensions among the elderly. For them Boundary behaviors do not occur when self disclosure occurs and vice versa; when Conflict takes place in their groups, so does Subgrouping, but members do not show Boredom. When the elderly Organize, they also turn to the leader (mainly with queries, appeals or other structuring needs). Boredom is also associated with such efforts at Organizing. When the Organizing is going on, Support is neither being given nor received. When Self-disclosure occurs among the elderly the group leader's activity level is increased.

The patterns unique to the younger adults are few by comparison. There are only two associated processes, both involving Boredom. Signs of its occurrence are associated with leader activity (leader-to-group) and group initiatives to the leader (Group-to-leader).

What is the significance of the apparent differences between the age groups. If indeed boundary utterances are more characteristic of elderly persons than of young adults, as our data suggest, it is of considerable practical importance to the future application of helping techniques. Are we dealing with an age-developmental phenomenon alone or with an interaction of personality and experienced social status? The fact of the matter is that Boundary behaviors expressed in terms of "we/they" utterances are inevitably social as well as personal and are doubtless affected by the current

status of feelings among elderly persons as members of an embattled and to some extent disadvantaged social minority in Western Society. It is of practical significance to the help intending process that older adults exceed younger ones in such utterances and, by implication, use the group to anchor them. Would such a difference occur in less "youth-oriented" societies? In other words, to what extent is an age factor independent of or intertwined with the social setting or other societal factors? We cannot answer this question. All we can say is that elderly persons appear to make Boundary use of support groups more than do our younger group participants.

What is true of "we/they" (Boundary) utterances is also true of Self disclosure. The elderly do more of it. Now an interesting aspect of this finding is that it is contrary to most psychotherapists' published evaluations and to the conventional wisdom of psychological practitioners. It is the young who are expected to be more disclosive (Jourard, 1971). It may be that the elderly are at a time of life when multiple sad events have occurred, but when they share their losses and/or concerns in some confidence that peers and age-mates have had similar experiences. The young may be less confident that others can share their worries and fears. This leads to the rather intriguing possibility that, in their fashion, elderly group members can be less rather than more "defensive" if being disclosive is viewed as the contrary of defensiveness. It appears that as with Boundary behaviors, the elderly use their groups to share and compare more than do the young, at least at the level of revealing some types of inner concerns, specifically, those involving losses and worries. Conflicts were more frequently noted among the elderly. Does this suggest that the older adults

fear to disagree less than do the young? That they are, simply as the popular stereotype would have it, more "cantankerous" and fussy? Regardless of the reasons for this finding, the point is that this apparent readiness of the elderly to disagree with one another and to take up verbally agonistic positions may have some helping group implications. Conceivably, arguing with each other can be stimulating, hence in its own way as therapeutically useful as is Support in its. The relative avoidance of Conflict by the young leads us to speculate about the interplay of conflictful elements in development at their time of life. For instance, does the less certain "identity" of the college youth determine a more cautious interaction in minimally structured groups such as the ones we conducted? Clearly, these findings of difference do not suggest that group helping approaches would be generally more appropriate or inappropriate to either age population, but rather that they may need to take into account the relative salience of these processes as they occur in either age group.

The finding of more frequent leader intervention in the groups of the elderly could be related to the greater amount and frequency of disclosures among them. It could also be responsive to the frequency of Conflict.

Since our staff leaders were under instruction to intervene minimally, it seems safe to say that these interventions occurred in response to some perceived need in the group (whether accurately or inaccurately "coded" by the leader.) In this connection, it is important to note that this response by the leader was in fact more frequently made to the less educated elderly and may have represented his judgment that they needed or wanted help more than the well-educated elderly or the young.

That the groups are similar in the coded frequencies of Support, Subgrouping, Organizing, and Group-to-leader initiatives (appeals, queries, comments) suggests, as do many of the correlated processes discussed below, that the generally supportive aspects of helping groups do foster common responses. Wehn H. S. Sullivan, the American psychiatrist, was once confronted by an apparent overemphasis on differences between "normals" and "pathological" cases he is reputed to have responded, ". . . But we are all so much more human than otherwise" When adults, young or old, are involved in support group interactions where disclosure, sharing, and comparing take place, they are attentive, and proffer at least verbal support. We all know from our experiences of being in relatively intimate peer groups how we can become enthralled in listening to another's revelations. We try to keep conversations going through endeavoring to find topics of common interest. We cluster with our fellows and seek structuring from our leaders when in doubt as to how to proceed. These elements are part and parcel of any helping group as well and they are common to old and young.

The relationships among some of the processes for the elderly are more numerous and take on the appearance of a pattern. The only correlated associations among processes for the young involved signs of Boredom and both were leader-group or group-leader interactions, suggesting lesser degrees of involvement in the group interactions.

This difference in patterning suggests one possible explanation that must be considered, namely that the differences in patterns and frequencies are merely a function of the "pull" of the group experimental context which was, of course, known to the young as well as to the elderly participants.

While all participants were Volunteers, the young adults did participate as "subjects" and, as is customary, received research credit in their psychology courses. While the elderly were also volunteer "subjects" for this "helping research", they may have interpreted the focus of the investigation as more germane to their own concerns. It is conceivable that the possible discrepant attitudes of the participants could have affected Boredom and reduced, or at least influenced Disclosure, and in general have contributed to relative guardedness, especially on the part of the young. Along the same lines, but from a different perspective, it is possible that leader responsiveness to the Senior Citizens was influenced by his concerns regarding their understanding of the group's task and function so that he acted more actively to explain, to elicit, or to reassure--despite the injunction to treat all groups alike and to minimally intervene in all of them.

There are other limitations which mandate caution in interpreting the differences and the patterns of group interactions reported here. The instability of several group dimensions requires that we continue to attempt to achieve better rules of transformation so that the group forms readily observed in children undergo recognizable and understandable transition to adult forms. We could illustrate by reference to Establishing importance for which poor reliability was achieved for adults. As a matter of fact, it was unequivocal among children and salient in its unsubtle appeal to "look at me! See what I am doing!" We do not know whether the concept is unclear or whether there may be some kind of constant error owing to coder age and life experience. (There is a curious tendency for our college aged coders to have greater difficulty in some forms with utterances of old people and

in others with those of their age mates.) Emotional ambience also proves difficult to code, as we expected it would; however, overt emotional behavior (of Self disclosures) is relatively easily coded.

Another limitation involves sample limitations. In this preliminary study, it is clear that educational levels differentiate elderly participants, especially with regard to such factors as dependency (Group-to-leader) and expressed as appeals for structure, clarification questions and the like. It is significant that the more educated addressed their task of mutual communication with fewer Organizing efforts and our speculation is that they required fewer. The more educated by contrast with the Senior Citizen's groups, may experience more self assurance and relative autonomy. Of course, these speculations though they accord with our impressions, are not based on hard evidence. In general, although it may be unrealistic to hope to secure completely balanced representation in population samples, it is clear that the significance of findings in areas of group interaction are especially dependent upon adequate sampling. Thus, in future research one must try to take more of the population variables into account. The current data are, in this sense, only suggestive and cannot be treated as guides for action without support from future, more comprehensive studies. As in many other age-comparative investigations age is not the only important variable, even though it is a significant one.

In summary, we may say that the elderly--as a group--appear to be making more use of helping group processes--to be more involved in them--albeit in a way which emphasizes certain group forms--rather than others--chiefly those involving Disclosive, Conflict and Boundary aspects. The pat-

terns of the elderly as reflected in associations or correlations among their processes also appear to reflect a greater involvement in certain aspects of the group interactions. However, the helping group commonalities of reciprocal Support and Disclosure behaviors are apparent for all--in keeping with Sullivan's dictum about our shared human proclivities.

In conclusion, we may say that the scheme of group forms, adapted to a life-span developmental comparison of group behaviors in groups of elderly and of young adults yielded some differences in frequencies and patterns of group processes. However, methodological limitations and obstacles remain to be overcome in this approach to the study of group behaviors among different ages. These considerations mandate caution in the interpretation of these findings, especially in terms of their practical implications and applications for helping group interventions. The findings are viewed as encouraging for the idea of a developmental perspective on group interactions and, for ultimately more effective group helping approaches to different age groups.

References

- Butler, R. V. Psychiatry and the elderly: An overview. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1975, 132.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.
- Hartup, W. W. Peer interaction and social organization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.) Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology, (3rd edition), New York: Wiley, 1970, 361-452.
- Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure: An experimental analysis of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971.
- Lakin, M., Lakin, Musia J., and Costanzo, P. R. Group processes in early childhood: A dimension of human development. International Journal of Behavioral Development. (In press)
- Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I., and Miles, M. Encounter Group: First Facts. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- McGee, Jeanne and Lakin, M. Social perspectives on psychotherapy with the aged. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice. Vol. 14 #4, Winter, 1977, pp. 333-342.
- Shaw, M. and Costanzo, P. R. Theories of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Strupp, H. H., Hadley, S. W., and James-Schwartz, B. Negative effects in psychotherapy: Clinical theoretical and research issues. New York: Jason Aronson. (In press)

GROUP PROCESS RATINGS

<u>BOUNDARIES</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	no mention of groups		specific groups named		fixed boundary generalizations		generaliza- tions heavily emphasized
<u>SUBGROUPING</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	no evidence		implicit recog- nition within subgroup		overt, effects discussion		discussion centers on subgroups
<u>NORMS</u> (Social pre- scriptions)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	no norms	stated once		generalized norm	important to discussion		focus on emphatic convictions
<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	no initiatory statements		few attempts to direct		frequent efforts to control		many efforts to control
<u>ESTABLISHING IMPORTANCE</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	relating on equal basis		some efforts to impress		frequent competitive statements		highly competitive
<u>GROUP TO LEADER</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	no need of leader			more than to each other		question leader depen- dently on leader	heavy
<u>LEADER TO GROUP</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	no inter- vention			drawing in people		very active	pulling for specific effect
<u>SELF-DISCLO- SURE</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	neutral	little feeling of self	some talk of self expressed	feelings expressed	vulnerable		highly personalized discussion
<u>CONFLICT</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	consensus	minor contradictions	disagree	diverse opinions		arguing to win	heated arguing
<u>SUPPORT</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	nonup- portive			support on issue			support of person
<u>GROUP TONES</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(a)	light chatty						heavy, seriously invested,
(b)							anxious
(c)	comfortable						
	high attentive						bored, inattentive

FIGURE 1: PROCESS RATING FORM

ORGANIZATION	# GROUPS	MALES/ FEMALES	± AGE	± YRS. ED.	RACE B/W
Senior Citizens Center #1	2	3/4	73	10	1/8
Senior Citizens Center #2	3	1/10	70	10	1/8
Learning In Retirement	2	2/3	69	16	1/8
Duke U.	5	1/1	19	13	1/8

TABLE #1: SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

PROCESS	r OLDER ADULTS	r YOUNGER ADULTS
BOUNDARIES	.86	.78
SUBGROUPING	.98	.98
NORMS *	.72	.35
ORGANIZING	.80	.71
ESTABLISHING IMPORTANCE *	.00	.35
GROUP TO LEADER	.82	.79
LEADER TO GROUP	.85	.96
SELF-DISCLOSURE	.71	.47
CONFLICT	.43	.58
SUPPORT	.59	.71
LIGHT- HEAVY *	.64	.31
COMFORTABLE - ANXIOUS *	.32	.66
ATTEND - BORED	.63	.61

TABLE 2: RATER RELIABILITY FOR THE
MEAN SCORE OF TWO RATERS

* - Starred categories are not reported due to
low rater reliability.

PROCESS	$\bar{x}$ OLDER ADULTS	$\bar{x}$ YOUNGER ADULTS	t	GROUP RATED HIGHER
BOUNDARIES	3.77	2.81	6.52	old
SUBGROUPING	1.60	1.35	2.45	N.S.
ORGANIZING *	2.46	2.64	-1.65	N.S.
GROUP TO LEADER *	2.14	2.12	0.13	N.S.
LEADER TO GROUP *	3.21	2.57	4.57	old
SELF-DISCLOSURE	3.35	2.56	6.96	old
CONFLICT	2.66	2.16	4.18	old
SUPPORT ■	3.51	3.68	-2.04	N.S.
ATTEND - BORED	1.62	1.98	-4.19	young

TABLE 3: COMPARISON OF OLDER AND YOUNG ADULT'S
GROUP PROCESSES ($p < .01$)

* - Starred categories indicate processes affected within
the elderly by education level differences be-
tween groups.

PROCESS	OLDER ADULTS (N=230)	YOUNG ADULTS (N=132)
BOUNDARIES	- self-disclosure	
SUBGROUPING	+ conflict - attend → bored	
	+ group to leader	
ORGANIZING	+ attend → bored - support	
	+ leader to group	+ leader to group
GROUP TO LEADER	+ organizing - conflict	+ attend → bored - conflict
	+ group to leader	+ group to leader
LEADER TO GROUP	+ self-disclosure	+ attend → bored
	+ leader to group - boundaries	
SELF-DISCLOSURE	+ support - attend → bored	+ support - attend → bored
	- group to leader	- group to leader
CONFLICT	+ subgrouping - attend → bored	- attend → bored
SUPPORT	+ self-disclosure	+ self-disclosure
	- subgrouping	
	- support	
	- self-disclosure	+ group to leader - self-disclosure
ATTEND → BORED	+ organizing - conflict	+ leader to group - conflict

TABLE 4: INTERPROCESS CORRELATIONS FOR GROUPS OF OLDER AND
YOUNG ADULTS ($\alpha < .01$)